

Responding to the Challenge: The Impact of Reclamation's Hydraulic Laboratory on Water Development

by Philip H. Burgi
Wheat Ridge, Colorado

The paper covers the history of Reclamation's hydraulic laboratory from its inception in 1930 at Colorado Agricultural Experiment Station, Fort Collins, Colorado to the present. Emphasis is placed on the laboratory's historical role in developing new design concepts for hydraulic structures to meet Reclamation's ever increasing challenges over the past seventy years and specifically during the highly productive quarter century from 1948 to 1973.

The paper briefly presents innovative design concepts developed for hydraulic structures and equipment as the design challenges increased from the early development of Shoshone Dam (1910) through Upper Stillwater Dam (1980's). These design concepts included tunnel spillways, spillway flip buckets, high head control gates and valves, labyrinth spillways, fuse plug spillways, stepped spillways, and various energy dissipators. The paper presents the design challenges associated with specific structures such as: Hoover Dam side channel spillway, Grand Coulee Dam spillway bucket, Hungry Horse Dam tunnel spillway, and more recently the aeration slot design developed for Reclamation's tunnel spillways to prevent cavitation damage.

During the 1950's and 1960's Reclamation's hydraulic laboratory initiated an extensive research program to develop standard designs that eventually became the foundation for a number of engineering monographs and manuals authored by hydraulic laboratory staff. Previously each design leader assembled a design manual based on their training and experience. These were passed on to younger engineers over time, but eventually the need for engineering monographs and manuals became apparent. The paper will summarize the development of these documents and their role in the design of modern hydraulic structures in the United States and world-wide.

The history becomes alive as one looks at the various laboratory locations and the renowned hydraulicians who influenced Reclamation's hydraulic designs through early cooperation with TVA and Panama Canal designers, and the influence of young graduates from Purdue and other eastern universities.

The paper concludes with some of the hydraulic design challenges facing Reclamation in the next century. The water management issues associated with fish passage at numerous dams in the western U.S. and the need to decommission structures that have out-lived their useful life are some of the hydraulic issues challenging Reclamation's future.

**Responding to the Challenge: The Impact of Reclamation's Hydraulic Laboratory on
Water Development**
by Philip H. Burgi

BACKGROUND

The Bureau of Reclamation was established in 1902. In its first ten years eighteen dams were built. By 1930 fifty dams had been constructed. The first irrigation projects were fairly simple, consisting of a diversion dam, headworks, canals, and turnouts. These early projects involved no special challenges other than those peculiar to each site. However, maximum development of the West's limited water supplies required the development of projects far greater in size than those early structures. To optimize water basin development, dams of increasing height were required and their construction created new problems and provided serious challenges for Reclamation's design and construction engineers.

The function of hydro-power was introduced by the 1906 Congress when it authorized the sale of excess power generated at Reclamation projects. In 1928 Congress passed the Boulder Canyon Project Act (The name Boulder Dam was changed to Hoover Dam on April 3, 1947 by joint congressional resolution). This act inaugurated a new era in the conservation and utilization of western water. Hoover Dam would be the principal structure of the Boulder Canyon Project and would introduce a new concept in western water development referred to as multi-purpose development. Other projects would soon follow including: Central Valley Project in California, Columbia Project in Washington, Colorado-Big Thompson Project in Colorado, and the Missouri

River Project in the Great Plains. These multi-purpose projects maximized utilization of water and land resources in large areas of entire river basins. Thomas J. Rhone presents a histogram showing the number of dams built in each of seventeen five year periods between 1902 and 1988.¹ He states the quarter century between 1948 and 1973 was especially productive when more than half of Reclamation's dams were constructed.

THE EARLY YEARS

In the early years before 1930, many of Reclamation's engineers were recruited from Reclamation's parent organization, the U.S. Geological Survey. The supervisory staff of the design units maintained extremely high engineering standards for their personnel. Typically, each design leader assembled and maintained a design manual based on their training and experience; these informal manuals were passed on to subordinates who, in turn, added to the standards and through their new knowledge and experience became even better qualified designers. In these early documents gathered by Reclamation's design engineers there are many references to names such as Horace W. King, William P. Creager, Julian Hinds, Theodore Rehbock, and other renowned hydraulicians.

When Reclamation completed the construction of Shoshone Dam in Wyoming in 1910, it was the highest dam in the world at 328 ft. In the next 25 years Reclamation held this record three more times with the construction of Arrowrock Dam in Idaho at 349 ft in 1915, Owyhee Dam built in eastern Oregon at 417 ft in 1933, and finally Hoover Dam on the Colorado River at 726 ft in 1936.

Reclamation's hydraulic laboratory was established in the early 1930s expressly to solve the technical challenges presented in the design of these large structures. With the anticipation of designing Hoover Dam there came the recognition that this structure would impose design and construction challenges well beyond the textbooks and experience of the day. With the tremendous construction costs associated with these large structures it became evident that careful preliminary design and model testing were a requirement before one could finalize design and start construction.

RECLAMATION'S HYDRAULIC LABORATORY

Although the name "hydraulic laboratory" is relatively modern, the concept has been around for a long time. Scholars as early as Leonardo da Vinci recognized the importance of experimentation when dealing with the flow of water. He is quoted as saying, "Remember when discoursing on the flow of water to adduce first experience and then reason".² The purpose of the hydraulic model is to use the tool of similitude to demonstrate the behavior of flowing water at reduced scale. Typically, models are used to study waterways of hydraulic structures and equipment such as: spillways, outlet works, stilling basins, gates, valves, and pipes associated with large dams. Agreement between model and prototype have proven very satisfactory and complete for overflow spillways, gates and valves, and outlet features.^{3, 4, 5} The high efficiencies and smooth operating characteristics of large modern turbines, pumps, and gates and valves can be attributed to model experiments. **Figure 1** illustrates a typical model - Bartlett Dam on the Verde River in Arizona from two perspectives: an aerial view and a 1:60 scale laboratory model.

At the turn of the 20th century, some European universities and especially schools in Germany

recognized the value of experimental model studies to solve hydraulic challenges such as those posed by dam spillways and outlet works, siphons, tunnel inlets, and bridge constrictions on rivers. John R. Freeman (1855-1932), a hydraulic engineer from the United States, felt very strongly that the States should develop similar hydraulic laboratories to those being utilized in Europe. In 1924 he visited laboratories in Berlin, Dresden, Brunn and Karlsruhe. He had a significant influence on the development of hydraulic laboratories in the United States. Freeman writes in 1929, *“Nowhere, yet, in America has the writer found the acceptance and reliance upon the doctrines of similitude which he has found at substantially all of the great European engineering universities, and which have been developed there wholly during the past 30 years, and mainly during the past 10 years.”*⁶

Beginning in the early thirties, laboratory activity in engineering schools in the United States greatly increased. Freeman describes some of the early work conducted in laboratories in the United States: Cornell University (1899), State University of Iowa (1919), Alden hydraulic laboratory of the Worcester Polytechnic Institute (1910), and several commercial laboratories conducting experimentation with hydraulic turbines. Eventually, hydraulic laboratories were established in government facilities such as the Miami Conservancy District in Ohio, the U.S. Bureau of Standards, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Soil Conservation Service, and the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation.

Investigations with hydraulic models had their start in the Bureau of Reclamation in August 1930 when a dozen engineers, technicians, and craftsmen from the Denver Reclamation Office began working in the hydraulic laboratory of the Colorado Agricultural Experiment Station in Fort

Collins, Colorado. The 2600 ft² laboratory was built in 1912 under the direction of Ralph Parshall.⁷ **Figure 2** presents the Reclamation hydraulic laboratory staff in Fort Collins in April 1931.

By 1935, the laboratory in Fort Collins had expanded to four times its original size to handle the ever increasing Reclamation work load. The work began with a study of the proposed shaft spillways for Hoover Dam. As a result of these studies a change was made from the original shaft spillway concept to two side-channel spillways to accommodate the design flow which had increased from 200,000 to 400,000 ft³/s.

The history of Reclamation's Hydraulics Laboratory is reflected in the lives of the early leaders. In the summer of 1929, Emory Lane, was appointed by the Bureau of Reclamation as engineer in charge of hydraulic, sediment, and earth materials research studies. He was a graduate of Purdue and Cornell Universities and worked for the Miami Conservancy District, Ohio before coming to Reclamation. During his 6-year period as administrator of the hydraulic laboratory, Mr Lane initiated the comprehensive laboratory investigations undertaken for Hoover Dam, Grand Coulee Dam, Imperial Dam and de-silting works and the model studies of the All American Canal structures.

In 1931 **Jacob Warnock**, another graduate of Purdue, came to Reclamation as an associate hydraulic engineer after working with the Corps of Engineers in their Chattanooga, Nashville, and Huntington offices. By 1934 Warnock, became head of the hydraulic laboratory in Fort Collins when Emory Lane moved to Denver to direct a small hydraulic laboratory that had been set up in

the basement of the Old Custom House in Denver. Many of the smaller structures designed by Reclamation were studied during this mid 1930's period in the Denver Custom House. Victor Streeter, who later became a renowned Professor of Hydraulics at the University of Michigan was one of the staff members in Denver during this period.

In a summary article written in 1936, Warnock stated, *“Models were first used extensively by the Bureau in 1930 in the design of the spillway for the Cle Elum Dam of the Yakima project in Washington. The design of the spillways for Boulder Dam, Madden Dam in the Panama Canal Zone, and Norris and Wheeler dams for the Tennessee Valley Authority, served as stepping stones in further developing the technique and improving the methods.”*⁸

Warnock was a strong believer in the importance and value of hydraulic model investigations.⁹ *“The procedure by which models of hydraulic structures are built and tested in the laboratory before the design is finally adopted and committed to construction is analogous to the manner in which a newly designed machine is thoroughly inspected for defects and imperfections at the factory. The models reveal undesirable features of the design and indicate the proper means for the correction.”*¹⁰ **Figure 3** shows Jacob Warnock with Reclamation design engineers in the old Custom House in Denver (circa 1936).

By 1935 Jacob Warnock became head of the laboratory in Denver and was instrumental in its move to the New Custom House in 1937 where there was approximately 5100 ft² available for studies.

The work of the laboratory became so prolific that Reclamation tested 80 models in the period from 1930-38 and had 50 engineers, technicians, and craftsmen working in three laboratories.

*“The use of models has proved so advantageous in indicating opportunities for reducing costs and improving hydraulic properties that the work of the laboratories is now recognized as a regular part of hydraulic design. At the present time, the three laboratories are engaged in testing or constructing models of twenty different features relating to ten major projects.”*¹⁰

In the Fall of 1938 Reclamation discontinued its work in the Fort Collins laboratory. Warnock figured prominently in the design of the hydraulic features of Hoover, Grand Coulee, Shasta, Friant, and many other large dams and irrigation projects in the west. His untimely death in December, 1949 at the age of 46 was a great shock to Reclamation’s Denver Center.

Harold Martin also a graduate of Purdue University came to Reclamation in 1933. He served as assistant to Warnock and took over as head of the hydraulic laboratory in 1950 and remained Chief of the laboratory until his retirement in 1969. During this period, Reclamation’s hydraulic laboratory became best known for its work in development of a wide variety of energy dissipators under the direction of Joseph Bradley and Alvin Peterka. Of equal importance was the testing and development of new designs for high-head gates and valves spearheaded by James Ball.

The wartime westward shifting of population and industry created an impetus and need for a Reclamation construction program much larger after the war than it had been before. By 1943 Reclamation organized into seven regional areas based on large watersheds in the West and established a Chief Engineer’s Office in Denver responsible for all design and construction. The

small laboratory space in the New Custom House was inadequate for the enlarged program. Sufficient space was available at the former Denver Ordnance Plant (Remington Small Arms Plant) located on the west side of Denver and now referred to as the Denver Federal Center (DFC).¹¹ R.F. Walter, Chief Engineer, J.L. Savage, Chief Design Engineer and Ralph F. Blanks were primarily responsible for the move to the DFC. The laboratory staff designed and helped build much of the present laboratory infrastructure and specialized equipment.

In the later part of 1946, the hydraulic laboratory was moved to its present home in the Denver Federal Center where it occupied some 53,000 ft² of laboratory space. At the time, Reclamation controlled about 20 acres of the Denver Federal Center and there were over 2240 employees in the Denver Center. **Figure 4** illustrates the large warehouse area of Building 56 at the DFC as it was being transformed into a hydraulic laboratory with large water storage channels.

In 1950, Commissioner Michael Straus and Chief Engineer L.N. McClellan dedicated Reclamation's engineering facilities at the Denver Federal Center. These facilities were unequalled in their specialized qualifications anywhere in the world. Design and construction engineers worked in tandem with experts in hydraulics, concrete, soils, chemical, and other laboratories to meet the new challenges of water development in the arid west.

A quote from the July 1950 edition of *The Reclamation Era* states, "*The combination of men and laboratory equipment is paying huge dividends to the public. Water and power users, who ultimately pay for Reclamation projects, pay for the work of the Branch of Design and Construction. They should be reassured to know that economies in construction discovered at*

*the Center have more than paid for its total operating costs, as well as the entire cost of establishing and equipping it. Many of the money-saving techniques and materials conceived in connection with specific construction works will apply as well to later works, thus compounding the monetary economies.”*¹² **Figure 5** illustrates the size of the staff in Reclamation’s hydraulic laboratory in 1948 and how quickly the laboratory had developed by 1949.

There were other hydraulic laboratories developed and used by Reclamation. In the period from 1931-1936, a laboratory was operated during the summer months on the South Canal of the Umcompahgre Project near Montrose, Colorado, where a pressure head of 50 ft and a flow rate of 200 ft³/s were available. The laboratory was used to test a large 1:20 scale model of the Hoover Dam side channel spillways with drum gates (earlier studies showed the inadequacies of the originally designed Stoney Gates), a complete sedimentation model of Imperial Dam on the Lower Colorado River and its appurtenant works, and a model of Grand Coulee Dam and spillway bucket. The Montrose laboratory staff included Charles Thomas, Walter Price, and Whitney Borland, the latter becoming well known for his work in sedimentation.

At least two dam sites had temporary hydraulic models installed on-site. For several years during the studies of the spillway for Grand Coulee Dam (Early 1940s), a 1:60 scale model of the structure was maintained at Grand Coulee. In 1939, laboratory facilities were installed in the Arizona canyon wall outlet house at Hoover Dam to use the 350 ft of pressure head and flow rate of 200 ft³/s to test the gates and valves for use at Hoover Dam. This laboratory was operated for several months in 1940 and 1941 and again in 1945 to complement studies made in the Denver laboratory at lower heads and flow rates.

In the late 1960's and early 1970's, testing of 9 inch model turbines for the Third Powerhouse at Grand Coulee Dam were conducted at the Estes Park Colorado Powerplant. The test facility was located on an 18 inch bypass line fitted with a venturi meter.

LABORATORY CONTRIBUTIONS

Spillways

Spillways at dams are used to pass the design flood and thus protect the dam from overtopping. Early in Reclamation history there were five general categories of spillways in use: “glory hole” or shaft-type (Gibson Dam), side-channel (Hoover Dam), overflow type (Grand Coulee), open chute type (Bartlett Dam), and enclosed tunnel chute (Seminole Dam).

The importance of adequate spillway design cannot be overemphasized. Operating experience with spillways for dams has revealed problems of two types: (1. inadequate capacity, and (2) unsatisfactory performance for design or less-than-design discharges. Historically, Reclamation has taken a very serious position toward adequately studying spillway performance before going to final design.

One of the first major impacts resulting from hydraulic laboratory studies was the major improvement in spillway capacity resulting from the replacement of the planned glory-hole spillway design for Hoover Dam spillways with the side-channel spillway that ultimately provided the desired spillway capacity.

These early model studies were conducted at Ft Collins and Montrose as well as the Custom

House in Denver. The large 1:20 scale model at Montrose was used to finalize the design of the drum gates on the side-channel spillways at Hoover Dam (total spillway capacity of 400,000 ft³/s) replacing the proposed Stoney gates which proved to be unsatisfactory during the model tests. A total of eight models were used in the hydraulic design of Hoover Dam with model scales of 1:20(2), 1:60(3), 1:64, 1:100, and 1:106.¹³

An additional four models were used in the design of Grand Coulee Dam ranging in scale from 1:30 to 1:184. A major improvement in the design for Grand Coulee Dam was the replacement of a proposed large hydraulic jump stilling basin with a roller bucket to dissipate the energy at the toe of the Grand Coulee spillway designed to pass 1,000,000 ft³/s. A construction savings of \$4,750,000 (1941 costs) resulted from use of the roller bucket energy dissipator developed in Reclamation's hydraulic laboratory.¹²

Reclamation's high dam tunnel spillways proved to be a very economical means to pass large flood discharges in lieu of building large capacity surface spillways and stilling basins on the dam abutments. However, as early as the winter of 1941 when the Arizona tunnel spillway at Hoover Dam operated for 116 days there was suspicion of the vulnerability of concrete to damage caused by high velocity in tunnel spillways.¹⁴ This spillway operation resulted in a large hole in the tunnel spillway elbow 46 ft deep, 30 ft wide and 115 ft long. The damage was thought to initiate at a "misalignment" of the tunnel invert just above the elbow. The damage was caused by high velocity flow passing over the roughness and leading to bubble formation (similar to boiling water) in the flow. When the bubbles collapsed, high energy shock waves were generated damaging the concrete. This phenomena is referred to as cavitation formation and damage. In the 1940's the damage was repaired by backfilling with river rock and then covering with a thick

layer of high quality concrete. The concrete surface had a very fine finish, almost terrazzo, to prevent reoccurrence of the cavitation. Tunnel spillways were later constructed at Yellowtail, Flaming Gorge, Blue Mesa, and Glen Canyon Dams. The cavitation damage problem surfaced again in June and July 1967 when the tunnel spillway at Yellowtail Dam discharged for 20 days at 15,000 ft³/s. By July 14 it was evident that there was a problem in the tunnel spillway. When drained and inspected a hole 7 ft deep, 20 ft wide and 46 ft long was discovered. In earlier laboratory investigations, Alvin Peterka found that with the introduction of as little as 7.5% air into the water flow, damage related to cavitation on concrete surfaces could be eliminated.¹⁵ Hydraulic laboratory studies on a 1: 49.5 scale model of the Yellowtail Dam tunnel spillway resulted in design of an aerator located immediately upstream of the elbow consisting of a 2.5 ft high ramp that extended circumferentially around the tunnel to just above the springline of the tunnel and provided air to the underside of the high velocity jet traveling through the tunnel. The first installation of an aerator in a tunnel spillway was at Reclamation's Yellowtail Dam.¹⁶

The observations of cavitation damage in the tunnel spillways at Hoover Dam and Yellowtail Dam created a concern among hydraulic researchers and designers. The problem was addressed in the early 1940's at Hoover Dam by placing a very smooth concrete surface in the tunnel elbow. However, over time the concrete surfaces in tunnel spillways develop offset cracks. By 1967 hydraulic laboratory staff developed the tunnel aerator, a unique technique to introduce air flow from the upper half of the tunnel spillway to the underside of the high velocity flow passing through the tunnel elbow. Although there were four other high dams with tunnel spillways (including Hoover Dam) that needed aerators added, these corrections did not occur until after the 1983 flood on the Colorado River.

As a result of heavy snowfall in the Rocky Mountains during the winter/spring of 1982 -83, high runoff in the Colorado River basin created the need to pass flood flows through tunnel spillways at Blue Mesa, Flaming Gorge, Glen Canyon, and Hoover Dams. The resulting damage was so extensive at Glen Canyon Dam's two tunnel spillways, that \$42,000,000 (1985 costs) and a year of reconstruction was required to repair the spillways and install aerators.¹⁷ **Figures 6 and 7** illustrate the similar cavitation damage which occurred in the Hoover Dam (1942) and Glen Canyon Dam (1983) tunnel spillways. Reclamation conducted extensive laboratory model tests to determine hydraulic performance of the aerators at these tunnel spillways. **Figure 8** illustrates the tunnel aerator concept developed by Reclamation's hydraulic laboratory staff.

By 1985 aerators were installed in all five of these high head tunnel spillways in the western United States. The left tunnel spillway (Arizona side) at Hoover Dam experienced cavitation damage in 1983 and had to be repaired with an aerator added despite the smooth surface placed in 1943. Henry Falvey wrote a comprehensive engineering monograph summarizing Reclamation's experiences and developments in cavitation damage control entitled, *Cavitation in Chutes and Spillways*.¹⁸ This publication was yet another of the numerous documents produced by the hydraulic laboratory staff to assist in the design of water projects.

Sediment Control Structures at Diversion Dams

In the period from 1950-1965 numerous model studies were used to develop sediment control measures at diversion dams. To develop the most satisfactory solution of a sediment control problem at a diversion usually requires a "movable bed" hydraulic model study. Structures and techniques such as curved guide vanes, short tunnel under sluices, and vortex tubes were

developed in the laboratory to exclude sediments. On large projects such as the All-American Canal, large settling basins were developed and built. However, the cost of these large structures was prohibitive for many of the diversion dams across the Plains States. These more economical solutions often include a simple gated sluiceway and using some of the water as a means to bypass the sediments around the diversion intake structure. Enos “Jim” Carlson served a key role in much of the development of Reclamation’s sediment control at diversion dams.¹⁹

Control Gates and Valves

It was clear in the 40's that as the size of dams and reservoirs was increased, for economic reasons it became necessary to design projects for multiple use, such as flood control, irrigation, power development, and river regulation for navigation. The rigorous demands imposed by such multiple use of a storage dam required that the outlets be designed to give close regulation of the rate at which stored waters were released. The increase in dam height lead to higher pressures and velocities and in many cases the need for larger capacity outlets. Many improvements in the mechanical design of valves and gates were made to meet the challenge of these new conditions. However, most valves and gates were designed for simple open or closed operations. Regulation in some cases was made by providing numerous outlets controlled by gates such as those used at Grand Coulee Dam where increase or decreases could be made in finite increments equal in value to the capacity of a single outlet. A more economical method of accomplishing regulation would provide better designed outlets with fewer gates and valves with larger capacity that could be controlled to permit variable release. Most valves developed prior to the 1930's were designed for pressure heads up to 425 ft which would be totally inadequate for the new dams proposed.

The Hoover Dam tunnel-plug outlets provided the most outstanding challenges. Each tunnel had

six - 72 in needle valves under pressure heads up to 560 ft. which can discharge up to 22,000 ft³/s into a 50 ft diameter concrete tunnel. The laboratory model studies included tests at scales of 1:106, 1:60, and 1:20 to assure the validity of the design against any scale effects. The final configuration selected represented a distinct improvement over those originally proposed. The laboratory tests also showed that large air vent tunnels originally proposed were not necessary resulting in construction savings of \$30,000 (1932 costs).²⁰ There were several occasions in the 1980's where the old internal differential needle valves failed during uncontrolled closure. In several cases, these uncontrolled closures resulted in loss of life. In the early 1990's Reclamation undertook additional studies to replace all of their needle valves across the West. The needle valves were soon replaced with large jet flow gates developed by Reclamation in the late 40's for Shasta Dam.

The preferred large valves for Reclamation dams were the needle valves (1909-1942) and the hollow jet valves (1950-1967). Over the years, Reclamation has upgraded outlet gates and valves from the early Ensign valves (1905-1915), to needle valves (1909-1942), to tube valves (1941-1945), to hollow-jet valves (1950-1967) and jet-flow gates (1945-67). James Ball, Donald Colgate and Donald Hebert were three key hydraulic laboratory contributors to Reclamation's work in the development of high-head outlet gates.²¹ A 1973 American Society of Civil Engineering article gives a summary of some of these gates and valves and their installations across the United States.²²

In the mid 1970's a new gate design was developed in Reclamation's hydraulic laboratory called the clamshell gate. The clamshell gate has an excellent discharge coefficient and can be discharged to the atmosphere or submerged. Presently, Reclamation staff are designing clamshell

gates for replacement of the old Ensign needle valves in use since 1915 at Arrow Rock Dam in Idaho. **Figure 9** shows a model of a 6 in. clamshell gate with inventor Thomas Isbester.

Reclamation design engineers and hydraulic laboratory engineers have worked together over the past 70 years to improve existing designs and develop new gates and valves. Typically model tests consisted of 6 in. to 24 in. test valves with pressure heads up to 550 ft. **Figure 10** illustrates several model test gates and valves used in Reclamation's hydraulic laboratory.

Hydraulic Laboratory Techniques

In 1955 hydraulic laboratory personnel published Engineering Monograph No.18 entitled *Hydraulic Laboratory Practice*.²³ It was prepared as an aid in applying engineering knowledge and experience to hydraulic laboratory studies. Emphasis was placed on the basic principles of similitude; techniques of model design, construction, and operation; equipment; and field studies. The volume which has been used in hydraulic laboratories world-wide was updated by Jack Schuster in 1980 on the golden anniversary of the Bureau of Reclamation's first hydraulic model tests.²⁴

Stilling Basins and Energy Dissipators

Although hundreds of stilling basin and energy dissipating devices have been designed and built for spillways, outlet works, and canal structures, it is often necessary to make model studies of individual structures to be certain that these will operate as anticipated. In the early 1950's a ten-year laboratory research effort was undertaken to develop general design criteria for stilling basins and energy dissipators. Existing information was gathered from laboratory and field tests

collected from Reclamation records and experiences over a 23 year period. Hundreds of additional tests were conducted using six laboratory test flumes . The largest flume was 4 ft wide, 80 ft long with an available height of 18 ft and a discharge capacity of 28 ft³/s. Tests included hydraulic jump stilling basins, short stilling basins for canal structures and small spillways, wave suppressors for canal structures, sloping apron stilling basins, slotted and solid bucket energy dissipators, baffled apron drops, tunnel spillway flip buckets, and test to size riprap downstream of stilling basins. This effort conducted solely in Reclamation's hydraulic laboratory and supervised by Alvin Peterka, resulted in the world renowned Engineering Monograph No. 25 entitled, *Hydraulic Design of Stilling Basins and Energy Dissipators* ²⁵ which has been used for many years as a standard for such hydraulic structures world-wide.

The stilling basin as an energy dissipator is based on the concept of developing a hydraulic jump on a concrete pad immediately downstream of a spillway to dissipate the energy of the turbulent flow before it reaches the downstream channel. The hydraulic laboratory developed seven unique stilling basin designs where a hydraulic jump is used to dissipate energy. A widely used energy dissipator in this group is the impact basin often used at the downstream end of a pipe.²⁶ It is a very effective energy dissipator that is commonly seen today in urban flood control projects.

By the 1970s the trend for spillway terminal structures had returned to the flip bucket - the principle used was to direct the flow away from the structure and downstream a sufficient distance where the water could erode its own plunge pool or discharge into a pre-excavated plunge pool. Devices such as a combined hydraulic jump/flip bucket were used for the tunnel spillway at Yellowtail Dam and the surface spillway at McPhee Dam. The energy is dissipated within the basin at the end of the tunnel spillway up to a predetermined discharge where the jump

flips out and the structure acts as a flip bucket for larger discharges. Most of the tunnel spillways previously mentioned terminate with flip buckets designed based on various hydraulic model studies in the 50's and 60's. **Figure 11** illustrates the flip bucket at the terminus of the Crystal Dam spillway discharging in 1983.

A device called a baffled apron drop was developed in the laboratory primarily for use on canals as a drop structure at wasteways. In the late 1970's laboratory staff started looking at the baffled apron drop as a spillway structure for dams. In the 80's many baffled apron drops were used as spillways on several Reclamation dams as well as water development projects for the States of Washington, New Mexico and Nevada (Conconully Dam, Truth or Consequences Dam, Marble Bluff Dam).

THE HYDRAULIC LABORATORY IN THE 21st CENTURY

At the beginning of the 21st century, Reclamation continues to use the laboratory facilities at the DFC, however there have been many changes over the past 70 years. The laboratory itself has changed in many respects. There are new and improved microprocessor laboratory controls. An ozonator system has been installed to improve water quality and provide for longer use of recirculated water. There have been giant strides in electronic control and measurement as well as increased use of hybrid modeling where numerical and physical modeling techniques are brought together to better understand fluid mechanics. Skilled craftsmen who build the intricate models have always been part of the laboratory staff and continue to play a key role in laboratory studies.

Reclamation's hydraulic structures and equipment investigations and development in the period from 1930 through the 1970's resulted in world class technological advancements in water-

resource development. However, by the latter quarter of the 20th century a major paradigm change had occurred with water development in the United States. As public values shifted toward more environmental sensitivity, water agencies changed their focus from an emphasis on *water development* to *water management*. Reclamation's hydraulic laboratory program has maintained a contemporary focus throughout these changes over time. The new focus has led to an emphasis on developing improved technologies for (1. *protecting the public and the existing water infrastructure*, (2. *encouraging water-use efficiency*, and (3. *emphasizing environmental enhancement on regulated river systems*.²⁷

In the area of *water infrastructure protection*, Reclamation's hydraulic laboratory has played a key role in the development of cost-effective spillway designs focused on dam safety issues. Alternative spillway designs, fuse plug concepts, and overtopping protection concepts have been tested and developed. Laboratory research on the labyrinth spillway concept produced design criteria that were applied to the 14 cycle labyrinth spillway for Ute Dam in New Mexico.²⁸ The labyrinth spillway resulted in construction savings of over \$24,000,000 (1982 costs) compared to a traditional gated structure at Ute Dam.²⁷ The labyrinth concept provides the opportunity to expand the effective length of existing spillways resulting in a cost effective way to increase spillway capacity on existing structures. **Figure 12** shows the Ute Dam labyrinth spillway with a minimal overflow.

Another alternative spillway design gaining acceptance in the engineering community is the fuse plug concept. Reclamation's hydraulic laboratory advanced the science and acceptance of fuse plugs now used at several Reclamation dams. The fuse plug consists of an erodible embankment section usually placed in a saddle of a reservoir and built on an erosion-resistant invert. Designed

to fail after the service spillway capacity is reached, the fuse plug is much more economical to construct than large auxiliary surface spillways on the dam abutment. The fuse plug fails in such a manner as to provide a controlled flood release downstream from the dam.^{29, 30} The construction savings realized by using fuse plugs for additional spillway capacity for Horseshoe and Bartlett Dams on the Verde River in Arizona were in the range of \$150-300 million (1984 costs).²⁷

Figure 13 is an aerial view of Bartlett Dam and spillway with the new fuse plug spillway in a saddle on the left abutment of the dam.

Stepped spillway design criteria developed in Reclamation's hydraulic laboratory played a pivotal role in its world-wide acceptance in the 1990's. Stepped spillways are very compatible with Roller Compacted Concrete (RCC) construction and provide an economical spillway when constructed as an integral part of the dam. Hydraulic model studies of stepped spillways for McClure, Milltown Hill, Stagecoach, and Upper Stillwater Dams in the late 1980's were critical in defining energy dissipation characteristics and hydraulic performance of this new concept.³¹

Another recent advancement has been the protection of embankment dams during overtopping occurrences. In the past, flood flow overtopping an embankment dam was considered unacceptable. However, hydraulic research in recent years has greatly advanced the concept of embankment protection systems. Studies performed in Reclamation's hydraulic laboratory as well as tests performed in a large-scale outdoor overtopping facility at Colorado State University have proven the viability of 1 ft wide, 2 in high, and 2 ft long concrete blocks to protect the surface of an embankment.³²

Water-use Efficiency continues to play an important role in Reclamation's program. The Western United States depends on a water storage and delivery system built over the past 150 years to provide water for agriculture, municipal and industrial use, power generation, and recreation. Population growth and environmental water requirements place additional demands on a limited supply and require managers to look for water-use efficiencies. In response to this reality, the hydraulic laboratory has placed increased emphasis on conservation technologies. The ability to measure discharge in open channels on Reclamation projects has been dramatically improved in the last twenty-five years by the development and maturation of long-throated flume and broad-crested weir measurement methods as well as other technologies that are robust, low cost and accurate. These technologies continue to be developed and demonstrated by the hydraulic laboratory staff.

In 1953 Reclamation's hydraulic laboratory produced the first edition of the *Water Measurement Manual*. It was compiled from Reclamation's Manual for Measurement of Irrigation Water published in 1946. A second edition was published in 1967. The most recent edition published in 1997 still emphasizes the basics of water measurement but is updated to include the latest measurement technologies.³³

It is also available on the world-wide web at: **<http://www.usbr.gov/wrrl/fmt/wmm/index.htm>**

In addition to water measurement, the laboratory staff has worked for over thirty years in water system automation. Reduced cost and increased capabilities of sensors, computer hardware, software, and data telemetry systems have brought practical canal automation capabilities within reach of the majority of water and irrigation districts in the western United States, including many smaller and older districts that still operate their systems using the same methods used decades

ago. **Figure 14** shows a typical canal turnout with flow measurement, automated gate control and telemetry capability.

Future water development will be closely linked with environmental enhancement as Reclamation continues to play a role in providing a high standard of living while protecting environmental resources. Historically, Reclamation has had a concern for the natural environment especially as it may impact fish and wildlife resources. In the late 1950's Reclamation's hydraulic laboratory staff assisted with the development and field and laboratory testing of a pilot fish screen structure constructed in the headworks of the Tracy Pumping Plant ³⁴ The structure was a temporary means of fish salvage, and served as an experimental facility to develop criteria for the design of a permanent structure. Perforated, stationary, and traveling screens as well as louvers, holding tanks and methodologies for transporting fish, were tested in the laboratory and at the pilot facility.

More recently, several fishery and stream restoration projects have built on this earlier experience and illustrate this new enhancement approach. To improve the winter-run chinook salmon population in the Sacramento River, the laboratory initiated an aggressive research study to develop temperature-control curtains in reservoirs such as Lewiston and Whiskeytown Lakes.³⁵ The use of this new temperature-control technology, as well as the steel shutter structure at Shasta Dam, has increased the selective withdrawal capability within the Sacramento River basin and improved the management of the river temperature by several degrees and greatly improving the habitat for anadromous fish species. The laboratory has also been involved in retrofitting

several Reclamation dams to provide selective withdrawal capability: Shasta, Lewiston, Whiskeytown, Hungry Horse, and Flaming Gorge Dams.

Within Reclamation a bioengineering focus (biological science and engineering) has led to new, innovative concepts for using hydraulic structures to manage regulated water systems in the West. This cooperation of hydraulic engineering and biological sciences in recent years has produced innovative technologies for fish screening, fish separation and handling, and fish passage upstream and downstream at dams and diversion works. These research efforts and experiences will soon be published as a Reclamation fisheries manual. On many Reclamation projects these advancements have been crucial to maintaining water deliveries while also providing new environmental benefits.

Summary

The history of Reclamation's hydraulic laboratory is a story of engineers, technicians and craftsmen who have had an attitude and work ethic best characterized by their persistent high quality work which they effectively used to tackle the challenges of water development in the West. To some degree, they were exceptional individuals but for the most part their greatest achievements resulted from their ability to work as a team. Although some individuals have been mentioned in this paper, one needs to recognize that the greater gains were almost always the effort of a team. There are many excellent engineers on the present staff who no doubt will become part of the great legacy of Reclamation's hydraulic laboratory, but future generations will make those judgements. Suffice to say, that Reclamation and the nation have benefitted greatly by the productivity of the hydraulic laboratory staff over the past seventy years. There are new challenges facing today's laboratory engineers and scientists and their responses to these

challenges will define the future legacy of the laboratory.

References:

1. Thomas J. Rhone, 50th Anniversary of the Hydraulics Division 1938-1988, ed. Adnan M. Alsaffar (ASCE, 1990), 132-147.
2. Gunther Garbrecht, ed., Hydraulics and Hydraulic Research A Historical Review-International Association for Hydraulic Research 1935-1985, A.A.Balkema/Rotterdam/Boston/1987.
3. “Conformity Between Model and Prototype in Hydraulic Structures”, Transactions, American Society of Civil Engineers, Vol 109, pg 3-193.
4. Philip H. Burgi, ed, Model-Prototype Correlation of Hydraulic Structures, Proceedings of the International Symposium, American Society of Civil Engineers, August 9-11, 1988. Pp 1- 480.
5. A. J. Peterka, ed, Engineering Monograph No. 16, “Spillway Tests Confirm Model-Prototype Conformance”,(U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation, 1954),62.
6. John R. Freeman, ed., Hydraulic Laboratory Practice, The American Society of Mechanical Engineers, 1929, 1-4, 17, 28-32, 697-742.
7. Hunter Rouse, ed., Hydraulics, Fluid Mechanics, and Hydrology at Colorado State University, Colorado State University,1980, 1-21.
8. Jacob E. Warnock, “Experiments Aid in Design at Grand Coulee”, Civil Engineering, November 1936, pp.737-741.
9. Jacob E. Warnock, Engineering Hydraulics, ed, Hunter Rouse (Wiley, 1950), 136-176.
10. U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation, Dams and Control Works, February 1938, 205-212.
11. The Engineers’ Bulletin, Colorado Society of Engineers, August, 1950, 4-6. 8.
12. U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation, The Reclamation Era, February, 1941, 29-32 and July 1950,127-128.
13. Boulder Canyon Project Final Reports, U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation, Part VI- Hydraulic Investigations, Bulletins 1-3, 1938.
14. Keener, “A Challenge to Hydraulic Designers”, Engineering News Record, November 18, 1943.
15. A. J. Peterka, “The Effect of Entrained Air on Cavitation Pitting”, Proceedings of the Joint Meeting of the International Association for Hydraulic Research, ASCE, Minneapolis, MN, August 1953.

16. D. Colgate, "Hydraulic Model Studies of Aeration Devices for Yellowtail Dam Spillway Tunnel", U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation, REC-ERC-71-47, 1971, 13.
17. P.H. Burgi and M.S. Eckley, "Repairs at Glen Canyon Dam,"Concrete International: Design and Construction of the American Concrete Institute, March, 1987, pp. 24-31.
18. H.T. Falvey, Engineering Monograph No. 42 Cavitation in Chutes and Spillways, U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation, 1990, 145.
19. Enos J. Carlson, "Laboratory and Field Investigations of Sediment Control Structures at Diversion Dams", Ninth Congress on Irrigation and Drainage, International Commission on Irrigation and Drainage, Moscow, 1975.
20. Engineering News Record, "Hoover Dam Number", December 13, 1932.
21. D.J. Hebert and J. W. Ball, "The Development of High-Head Outlet Valves", Report on Second Meeting, Appendix 14, International Association for Hydraulic Structures Research, Stockholm, Sweden, June 6-7, 1948.
22. Cortland C. Lanning, "High Head Gates and Valves in the United States", Journal of the Hydraulics Division, ASCE, Vol. 99, No Hy 10, October, 1973, pp. 1727-1775.
23. Engineering Monograph No. 18, "Hydraulic Laboratory Practice", U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation, 1955,111.
24. J.C. Schuster, ed., "Hydraulic Laboratory Techniques",U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation, 1980, 208.
25. A. J. Peterka, Engineering Monograph No.25 Hydraulic Design of Stilling Basins and Energy Dissipators, U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation, 1964, 217.
26. G.L.Beichley, "Hydraulic Design of Stilling Basin for Pipe or Channel Outlets", U.S.Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation, Research Report No 24, 1971,31.
27. Philip Burgi, Issues and Directions in Hydraulics , eds.Tatsuaki Nakato and Robert Ettema A.A.Balkema/Rotterdam/Brookfield/1996,187-198.
28. K.L.Houston, "Hydraulic Model Study of Ute Dam labyrinth Spillway", U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation, GR-82-7, August, 1982, pp 41.
29. C.A. Pugh and E.W. Gray, "Fuse Plug Embankments in Auxiliary Spillways", United States Committee on Large Dams, 1984.
30. C.A. Pugh, "Hydraulic Model Studies of Fuse Plug Embankments", REC-ERC- 85-7, December, 1985.
31. Kathleen L. Houston and Alan T. Richardson, "Energy Dissipation Characteristics of a

Stepped Spillway for an RCC Dam”, International Symposium on Hydraulics for High Dams, Beijing, China, November 15-18, 1988.

32. Kathleen H. Frizell and Brent W. Mefford, “Designing Spillways to Prevent Cavitation Damage”, Concrete International: Design and Construction of the American Concrete Institute, May, 1991, pp. 58-64.

33. Water Measurement Manual, 3rd ed., U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation, 1997, pp.400.

34. Thomas J. Rhone and Daniel W. Bates, “Fish Protective Facilities at the Tracy pumping Plant-Central Valley Project California”, 9th Hydraulics Division Conference, American Society of Civil Engineers, Seattle, WA, Aug 17-19, 1960.

35. Tracy B. Vermeyen and Perry L. Johnson, “Hydraulic performance of a flexible curtain used for selective withdrawal- a physical model and prototype comparison”, Proceedings, ASCE National Hydraulic Engineering Conference, 1993.